THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV AUGUST, 1951 No. 374

The Religious Value of Episcopacy[1]

I HAVE been asked to write a paper on "the religious value of episcopacy". If I understand this request rightly, I am not being asked to discuss either the historical origins of the episcopate or its theological grounds. My task is to try to analyse my feelings as a member of the Church of England, to try to set down as clearly as I can what the existence of bishops in the life of the church contributes to my experience of living as "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven".

I can do this only if I begin by trying to describe in general the "religious value" of sacraments. To the Anglican mind, whether or no a man actually calls Holy Orders a sacrament, the value experienced in the church's possession of a ministry in the episcopal succession is at bottom of the same kind as that which inheres in the sacraments. I have tried to give some account of this in *The Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy*, and as that book is now out of print I make no apology for quoting the passage at length.

"It is by faith that man lays hold on the forgiveness offered by God in Christ and is restored to his true life of growth in communion with God. This faith expresses itself in acknowledgment of sinfulness and impotence, in personal loyalty to Christ and reliance upon him for strength to serve him. This faith is both the expression of the man's own free response to the love of God shown forth in Christ, and also God's gift through which the man responds. How can this be so? Because it is exercised at that stage of development at which man can enter into relations with God as fully personal on both sides as those in which he stands to his fellow men. The activity of God is always fully personal, and man is personal enough to be able to receive from God that kind of help which does not negate but confirms his own free personal growth. In the Incarnation God paid man the compliment of treating him as a person, doing the work of atonement in such a way that his personal historical activity could be presented to succeeding generations by the preaching of the Word and kindle in man the personal response of love to love. Here, in this personal redemptive activity of God, whereby forgiveness is personally offered in order that by faith it may be personally received, we have the supreme manifestation of the grace of God.

"But the same God who thus approaches man personally to win his personal response is also the Creator who has given its existence to that spatio-temporal process which we call the universe, sustains it in being, and promotes its development. He gives it such habits

[1] A paper prepared for the Anglican–Free Church Conversations in September, 1949.

and endowments as it needs in order that it may produce organisms such as may become the seats of individualized personal life, and in all the sub-personal stages of their development he nourishes those organisms with such sustenance as they require for their growth in personality. As an earthly father feeds and clothes the bodies of his children and educates their minds, so God, in whose knowledge even the hairs of our head are numbered, controls us in one-sided personal relations in such a way as to make us capable of entering into mutually personal relations with himself and with one another.

"Is the Church, which exists to kindle the personal response of faith by preaching the Word, to bear no witness also to this creative and sustaining activity of God? That, to my mind, is the question which is posed by the teaching on grace characteristic of Catholicism and Orthodoxy.

"For in Catholicism and Orthodoxy the sacraments express a more comprehensive activity of God than that which is directly related to man's personal response. When I come in penitence and faith to receive the sacrament of Holy Communion, I cannot limit the divine activity in me to that of which I am consciously aware. He bids me do this in remembrance of him, and I come in obedience to his command. So far all is mutually personal. But when I come, my personal response at its best is poor and meagre; and only too often it is not at its best but is the response of one who is sleepy, or wandering in thought, or even conscious of hardly being a real individual self at all. Then my faith has to be shown in trusting God through Christ to give me all the sub-personal growth I need to constitute me a person and enable me to make the personal response of faith. Through the practice of the sacramental life I learn for myself the evangelical truth that I need the grace of God in order to have the faith which can respond to the divine calling. The sacrament is not the reward of faith, but the means by which God is drawing me to himself and creating in me both the sub-personal basis of my personal response and that personal response (such as it is) itself.

"It is this that enables me to appreciate and accept the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration as applied to infants. Though the minister may pour the water and speak the words of administration, what gives its whole significance to the service is the fact that the true agent is Christ himself, in whose name his Church is baptizing the children. It is Christ who is taking them up in his arms, laying his hands on them and blessing them. What limits can we set to the divine activity in the life of the children, nourishing their unconscious, sub-personal life with all that they need to become capable of conscious personal faith when they come to years of discretion?

"We must never forget that in every relationship the activity of God is fully personal throughout, even when we cannot respond to it personally. Between man and God there may be one-sided personal relationships approximating more or less to mutually personal relationships; there can never be mutually impersonal relationships. We reject uncompromisingly any conception of grace, sacramental

or otherwise, which would think of it as a something given by God to be appropriated by us. When God makes use of words or water or bread and wine or laying on of hands through which to express his divine activity, their only significance is as expressing his direct and personal action. When this is remembered there is nothing superstitious or magical in the belief that through the sacraments God is nourishing the sub-personal life of his creatures. To deny it would involve us in the pelagianism of asserting that by its own efforts creation can struggle upwards to personality, and only then has need of the grace of God."

We value sacraments for their expression of the truth that in our religious life it is God who acts first: what we call our religion is our response to God's prior activity. There is thus a special "religious value" in the fact that God makes use of impersonal means, of water and bread and wine administered with the appropriate formulas in obedience to his command to "Do this"—to *do* something, not to hold this or that theory of what is done or to be this or that kind of pious or virtuous person. We put our entire trust in our Lord's promise to be present and active when certain things are done as he directed, and this saves us from the pelagianism of thinking that God's gracious activity is contingent upon the presence of human wisdom, piety, or virtue.

No great extension of this sacramental principle is required to cover Holy Orders. From the second century to the sixteenth the sacramental *ministerium* of priest and bishop was conferred on new members of each order by the laying on of hands of existing bishops with appropriate formulas of prayer. Opinions differ among us Anglicans on the historical question whether this custom derived directly from our Lord's appointment during his earthly ministry, or, like the canon of New Testament scriptures, from the guidance of the risen and ascended Lord through the Holy Spirit. Which of these two theories we hold about its origin is irrelevant to the question of what the practice stands for in our church life to-day, i.e. the question of the "religious value" of episcopacy.

Of that I would say this. For us, in consecrations and ordinations the laying on of hands, with appropriate formulas, by bishops in the episcopal succession corresponds to the use of water in baptism and of bread and wine in the eucharist. It is the very impersonality, what some people might call the mechanical nature, of the means employed that gives the system its religious value. This is what ensures our putting our whole trust and confidence in God and not in man.

Twenty years ago I wrote of the eucharist:

"What, from this point of view, is meant by such a phrase as 'the real objective presence of Christ in the sacrament of Holy Communion'? It means that what is of most importance in that service is not what I am consciously aware of at the moment, but what he is doing. He has bidden me to come to him with penitence and faith—not to feel, but to do. Suppose that I have done my best in preparation to examine my conscience and ask God's forgiveness for what

needs it, and now show my faith by coming once again to entrust my life to him. Suppose that in spite of my best endeavour I cannot in the service overcome my sleepiness, or the coldness of my heart. Is Christ asleep because I am sleepy? Is his heart cold because I cannot feel? Thank God! what I am aware of in my own life is only a little fragment of the whole—the most important fragment indeed, but only important as that which I am to bring to him in trust that he will do in, for, and through me far more than I shall ever know on earth. Christ is not asleep because I am sleepy, and when there are problems to be faced or work to be done or temptations to be met, I may go forward boldly in the power of his strength made mine."[1]

Mutatis mutandis, I have the same conviction about my ministry. Unworthy as I know myself to be, I can put my trust in God, knowing that his bishop's hands have been laid on my head in the way that I believe to be in obedience to his command, confident that when in the exercise of my priesthood "there are problems to be faced or work to be done . . . I may go forward boldly in the power of his strength made mine." I must not, of course, allow this to be an excuse for carelessness in respect of wisdom, piety, or virtue. Defects and failures in any of these are hindrances to the fruitfulness of any man's ministry. That is so obvious as to go without saying. But fundamentally the ministry itself, the authority to exercise the ministry, and the spiritual blessings, such as forgiveness and communion with God, to be brought to men through the ministry, do not spring from any human quality of mine. I must be saved from any such self-trust by continually heeding the exhortation to stir up the gift that is in me by the laying on of the bishop's hands.

What is true of my ministry is also true of his. I may have a very poor opinion of some particular bishop's wisdom, piety, or virtue, and may deplore the fact that his defects are a serious hindrance to the fruitfulness of his ministry. But in spite of that he will have a claim to my obedience if I am subject to his jurisdiction, to my respect for his monitions, and to my reverence as commissioned by Christ to administer the sacraments of confirmation and ordination. For though Paul may plant and Apollos water, it is God that giveth the increase. We put not our trust in flesh and blood. It is the promises of God that are sure.

LEONARD HODGSON.

Great Preachers—VII. Luther

LUTHER entered on his career as a preacher reluctantly. His ordination to the priesthood laid on him no obligation to preach, but when as *doctor biblicus* he succeeded Staupitz in the Chair of Theology at Wittenberg, his professorial duties included preaching as well as teaching. That may partly explain his reluctance to accept the appointment, for more than once in his sermons he confesses that he would gladly escape the responsibility of preaching if he

[1] *Essays in Christian Philosophy*, p. 115.

could. The ministry of the Word was always a matter of high seriousness for him, and after twenty years' experience of it he admitted to a discouraged young preacher who sought his advice: "I can tell you preaching is not a work of man. Although I am old and experienced, I am afraid every time I have to preach." None the less, as it was part of his allotted task, he took it as his vocation—in the sense in which he taught evangelical Christianity to understand that term—and gave himself to it heart and soul. The thought that he had been duly called and appointed to the preacher's office, and had not set himself up as a preacher on some private impulse of his own, was often a source of strength and encouragement to him. For no man, he always held, has a right to preach publicly unless he has a call from God, either directly like the prophets and apostles of old, or mediately through human agency as in his own case.

For more than thirty years, with a minimum of interruptions through unavoidable absence from Wittenberg or through sickness, Luther steadily and indefatigably pursued his calling in classroom and pulpit. Besides his ministrations at the Town Church, he preached in the early years at services in his monastery, and later at family worship in his own household; he preached also on occasion at the Castle Church and often in parishes which he visited on business of various kinds. But his pastoral responsibility for the Town Church was always of chief importance to him. The congregation there was his special charge—*ecclesia mea*, he called it—for which he would have to answer on the Day of Judgment. He had colleagues to assist him, of course, both at the church and the university, for the vast program of preaching and teaching could not be carried out by one man. There were three public services every Sunday—at five and nine in the morning and at a variable hour in the afternoon—and one at least each weekday, with additional services at Festivals. Luther often preached four times (including family devotions) on Sundays, and regularly two or three times a week; once a quarter he undertook a two-week series four days a week on the Catechism; and during three protracted absences of Bugenhagen (between 1528 and 1539) he did duty for his colleague as well. Add to all this the sermons he delivered elsewhere, and we can understand his speaking of his "infinite labours" as a preacher, and his thinking after thirty years in the work that no one since St Ambrose and St Augustine had borne such a burden of preaching as he.

About 2,300 of Luther's sermons are extant, all but 200 of them from the years following the Diet of Worms, together with some outlines and notes.[1] He himself never had time to prepare his sermons for the press, but they were often taken down in shorthand and published by his friends. In this way his preaching exercised an influence far beyond the bounds of Wittenberg. Two well-known

[1] Scattered through many volumes of the Weimar edition (=*W.A.*) of Luther's works. See also: *Sermons on the most interesting aspects of the Gospel by Martin Luther* (London, 1830); *Select Works of Martin Luther* (tr. H. Cole, London, 1826); *The Martin Luther Christmas Book* (R. H. Bainton, Westminster Press, 1948)—a small but exquisite selection of Nativity Sermons, delightfully illustrated.

collections are the *Hauspostillen*,[1] consisting of short gospel expositions given in the family circle, which came to be widely used in Lutheran homes, and the *Kirchenpostillen*,[2] which are expositions of the epistles and gospels for Sundays and feast days through the year, intended primarily as an aid to less accomplished preachers. Luther once said he regarded the *Kirchenpostillen* as his "very best book, which even the Papists are glad to have". Well over half of the total number of extant sermons are on the gospels,[3] while the rest (except for a few without a text) are divided between the Old Testament and the remainder of the New, with a preponderance of the latter. Although Luther left lecturing on the gospels to his colleagues at the university, he seems to have had a decided preference for them in preaching.[4] In his choice of texts he almost invariably followed the course of the church year and the lessons traditionally prescribed. He normally preached at the nine o'clock service on Sundays, and expounded the gospel for the day—the epistle having been dealt with at the earlier service. On Sunday afternoons and at weekday services, series of sermons were often arranged, so that over a period of weeks and months a whole book of the Old or New Testament would be expounded consecutively.[5] The text on any particular occasion was rarely if ever a single verse, but rather a whole pericope; and the recurrence of the same texts year after year constituted no difficulty. One sermon does not exhaust the text, and even if it did, the same message could be heard again with profit. There was variety enough in the spiritual bill of fare without seeking perpetual novelty.

Luther's sermons are characterized by no stereotyped homiletical form. His introductory remarks, generally very brief, may refer back to a previous sermon, comment on the occasion, state the central point of the text or the headings under which it is to be treated, and so forth. Then follows the exposition, sometimes verse by verse, sometimes according to the divisions into which the text naturally falls, or which seem best to bring out the substance of its message. Sometimes there is a double exposition, "historical" and "spiritual"; very often we hear simply what the text teaches about faith and love. Exposition and application are interwoven throughout, and the usually brief conclusion may be simply a summary of the main

[1] *W.A.* LII (first published by Veit Dietrich in 1544).

[2] Parts edited by Luther himself in *W.A.* VII, 458–357; X, i, 1. 1–728; X, i, 2, 1–208; XVII, 2, 1–247.

[3] *Luthers Evangelien-Auslegung* (ed. E. Mülhaupt, Göttingen, 1938 ff.), of which a third volume has recently appeared, gives an extensive selection of these, forming a continuous exposition of the Gospels. G. Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung* (München, 1942), gives a detailed study of Luther's use of the Gospels. Statistical evidence would seem to suggest that Matthew was his favourite.

[4] The reading of the gospels in public worship, perhaps more than of any other part of the Bible, was for him a mark of the Christian Church—and a sign that even under all the corruptions and abuses of Rome the Church had not perished.

[5] For Luther's interpretation of the O.T. see H. Bornkamm, *Luther und das Alte Testament* (Tübingen, 1948).

point, a word of warning, exhortation, or comfort, a prayer, or even an abrupt: "That's enough for this time."

In the announcements immediately following the sermon, Luther would often urge the need for intercessory prayer, and often also vigorously rebuke specific faults and failings of his people: irregular attendance at Communion, moral laxity, dishonest trade practices, nightly brawling, and the like. They were for the most part a rough, untutored flock, whose irreverence and unresponsiveness could be a great trial to their pastor and preacher; and once, on New Year's Day 1530, he was driven to declare from the pulpit that he would preach to them no more—which, for a short time, he did not. Yet he was happier preaching to them than to courtiers and noblemen, in whom as a class he had little confidence. At Court, he said, it was necessary to preach "Moses with his horns, not Christ, who is kind and good". The gospel of grace and mercy was not for men who—with notable exceptions like his own Elector—had not yet learnt to give serious heed to the Law. Not that he did not also preach the Law at the Town Church; but he was severer towards "the great lords" because (as he explained to the young Margrave of Brandenburg in 1532), "while you can cut a sapling with a penknife, you need an axe to fell an oak". Asked on another occasion whether preachers have a right to criticize the government, he replied: "Of course they have!" and went on to explain that they have a duty, too, when rulers either do injustice or supinely permit it to be done to their subjects.

Among the qualifications necessary for a preacher Luther put first an aptitude for teaching and a good head, then a good voice, a good memory (so as not to be hampered by a manuscript), thorough preparation, and a knowledge of when to stop! He may fairly be said to have possessed them all in good measure himself, though he often came down from the pulpit highly dissatisfied with his performance. He made no fundamental distinction between preaching and teaching, for in his lectures he sought to quicken faith as well as understanding, and in his sermons to instruct as well as to edify. At the same time, although he might sometimes digress for the benefit of students in his congregation, he normally confined more abstruse exegetical and theological questions to the classroom. In preparing to preach, he always kept first in mind the simple folk—children and old people, labouring men and servant girls—to whom he must bring the message home. Using all his available resources of scholarship, and praying fervently that God would open the preacher's mouth and the people's ears, he sought to make his sermon as clear and simple as possible, while remaining faithful to his text. He practically never took the text simply as a starting-point for a topical discourse, and if at times he preached without a text (on the Catechism, for instance), his sermon was none the less thoroughly Scriptural—and thoroughly topical as well.

The preacher's task, as Luther sees it, is to say what the Bible says, or what God says in the Bible. This is not because he holds any fundamentalistic theory of the Bible, for he does not. The Bible is

for him a living book, with a message so vital that it needs no theory to bolster it up. It is full of living people and events and, above all, of the living Word of God. Everything in the Bible centres and finds its meaning in this creative Word, which is Christ, incarnate, crucified and risen from the dead. Hence, although Luther gradually abandons the traditional allegorical exegesis, with its mystical, tropological and anagogical applications of the text, his sermons never become merely historical lectures.[1] The people and events of the Bible live again with extraordinary vividness in his preaching—and not only they, but also those of his own time. Peasants and burghers, tradesmen and nobles, priests, prelates, mercenaries, doctors, lawyers, and the preacher himself, mingle with Moses and the prophets, with evangelists and apostles, and all the familiar figures of the gospel story. When Luther preaches, the congregation is not merely an audience, it is part of the sermon; and there it is brought—whether it will give heed or not—under the judgment and mercy of God in Christ. For Christ, crucified and risen from the dead, is the centre and soul of all Luther's preaching, as he is of the Bible itself.

Through the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, Luther believes, God has inflicted the decisive, though not yet the final, defeat on the powers of evil, the enemies of God and man, and has sent out preachers into all the world, calling on all men to repent and believe the good news. As men do repent and believe, they are reconciled to God, receive the forgiveness of sins and the Holy Ghost, and become partakers of Christ's victory—whereby they are at once committed to a ceaseless warfare against the world, the devil, and their own flesh. But unless the message of Christ, the Word of God, is brought to them, they cannot even begin to believe; and unless it is continually brought, they can scarcely hold fast their faith, let alone grow in it, in a world where so much contradicts it. That is why the *Predigtamt*, or Ministry of the Word (which includes also the Sacraments),[2] is of such supreme importance for Luther.[3] It is the means by which Christ, the living Word himself, continues and makes effectual in the present the redemption wrought once for all decisively in the past. It is the means by which he continues his campaign against the powers of darkness between the decisive victory of Calvary and the final triumph of his Parousia.

PHILIP S. WATSON.

[1] In 1520 he wrote: "It is not enough, nor is it Christian, to preach the works, life, and words of Christ as historical facts, as if the knowledge of these would suffice for the conduct of life, although this is the fashion of those who to-day must be regarded as our best preachers. . . . Rather ought Christ to be preached to the end that faith in him may be established, that he may . . . be Christ for thee and for me, and that . . . what his Name denotes may be effective in us" (*Treatise on Christian Liberty*).

[2] There is of course no question of rivalry between pulpit and altar. The Sacraments are preached in both Scripture and sermon; the Word is both spoken and enacted—incarnated—in the sacramental rite.

[3] The minister of the Word "cometh not as a private person, but as the King's Ambassador, and because of this dignity . . . he is honoured and set in the highest place. . . . And it is expedient that . . . he should magnify this his calling . . . like as the King's Ambassador magnifieth his office and calling . . . because he glorieth not in himself, but in the King which hath sent him" (Commentary on Gal. 1. 1).

Jesus: Christ *and* Moses—II

IV. ST STEPHEN

We now come to the acceptance by the first Christians of our Lord's position as the second Moses. We have already seen St Peter's allusion in his speech in the Temple to Deut. 18. 15–19.

But much fuller and more interesting is St Stephen's defence before the Sanhedrin.[1] This is so distinct in style[2] from the rest of Acts that it might be a very exact contemporary record of his words, and may well have become for early Christians a standard statement of their case. One of the main points in his argument is that a Jew who would be loyal to the memory of Moses should accept our Lord as his successor. Moses, he says, was "mighty in his words and in his works".[3] Moses supposed that his brethren understood that God "by his hand was giving them deliverance, but they understood not".[4] The word for deliverance is *σωτηρίαν*—salvation. As Moses, then, was a saviour, so is Jesus. As Moses was misunderstood, so is Jesus. "This Moses whom they refused, saying, 'Who made thee a ruler and a judge,', him *hath* God sent to be a judge and a deliverer".[5] Notice here the change from aorist to perfect tense. It almost suggests an identification of Moses and Jesus, as if he were saying, "God has at last sent the true Moses who is not only a ruler and a judge, but a judge and a deliverer. The word for deliverer is *λυτρωτὴν*, which means a ransomer or redeemer, one who pays *λύτρον*, a ransom. Surely this is, as we shall see later in St Paul,[6] a reading back into Moses the true attributes of Jesus. He then proceeds to quote the prophecy of Moses, already quoted by St Peter, and, no doubt, a proof text of the time: "A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me."[7] He continues: "This is he which was in the Church (*ἐκκλησιᾷ*) in the wilderness, who received living oracles to give unto us."[8] Again, it is so phrased as to suggest that his words are equally applicable to the first Moses and to the second. "To whom our fathers would not be obedient,"[9] so the Jews of his time were not obedient to Jesus; "for as for this Moses, we know not what has become of him"[10]—so, no doubt, the Jews were saying of our Lord after his Ascension into heaven. It is significant that St Stephen uses a phrase quoted directly from the *Assumption of Moses*: "in Egypt and in the Red Sea and in the Wilderness forty years."[11]

V. ST PAUL

It must be remembered that St Paul from the moment of his conversion became involved in a controversy which lasted the greater

[1] Acts 7. 2–40.
[2] The only similarity is that between Acts 7. 35 and Acts 5. 31 (St Peter's speech before the chief priests), and it is possible that the author is here echoing St Stephen. [3] Ver. 22. [4] Ver. 25. [5] Ver. 35. [6] See below, p. 290.
[7] Ver. 37. [8] Ver. 38. [9] Ver. 39. [10] Ver. 40. [11] Acts 7. 36 and *Ass. Mos.* 3. 11.

part of his ministry against both Jews and, still more, Judaizing Christians; the burden of his message is always that we are saved not through obedience to the Law but by faith in Christ, who has redeemed us. "The strength of sin is the Law." It was, therefore, inevitable that he was a little shy of speaking of Jesus as the second Moses; and it may well have been that his adversaries made the Mosaic Jesus central in their doctrine. For them Moses' roles of prophet, deliverer, leader, and mediator would become overlaid by Moses the Lawgiver. Indeed, it is possible that those parts of the New Testament in which the Mosaic Jesus is assumed are the parts which are not affected by the dominating influence of St Paul.

Yet, in spite of what has been said above, there is one passage, in 1 Cor. 10, when St Paul speaks, not of Christ as the second Moses, but of Moses as the first Christ.

"I would not that ye should be ignorant", he writes, "how that all your fathers were under the cloud and in the sea and were all baptized into (εἰς) Moses in the cloud and in the sea: and did all eat the same super-natural food, and did all drink the same super-natural drink. . . ." Thus for him the Eucharist was prefigured by the manna and the water from the stricken rock, and baptism by passing through the Red Sea, and, stranger still, by following the pillar of cloud and fire. And as Baptism for the New Israel is baptism into Christ, so Baptism for the old Israel is baptism into Moses. Indeed, he seems almost not to consider that there was any difference between the first and the second Christ, for the Rock from which they drank "was Christ", and five verses farther on the same apparent identity between the first Christ and the second appears. He reminds the Corinthians of the way the old Israel exasperated Moses by their sins and were punished by the serpents,[1] and he writes, "Neither let us tempt Christ[2] as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of the serpents." Here indeed is St Stephen's "Church in the wilderness" with a vengeance! If we cannot accept such teaching to-day, it is at least an aspect of the outlook of the early Church which we cannot ignore.

Much the same attitude is found in the Epistle to the Galatians,[3] where he is explaining the impotence of the Law to annul the promise made to Abraham. Here St Paul writes of a mediator. The modern Christian thinks instinctively of Christ, but St Paul's mediator is Moses.

Apart from these passages, the relationship between Moses and Christ in St Paul's writings is rather implicit than explicit. He is concerned with contrasting the two dispensations, that of the Law with its response of obedience, and that of Grace with its response of faith. The dispensation of Moses was a preparation for that of Christ. The dispensation of Christ has superseded that of Moses. In one place, indeed, he verges on an open comparison.[4] The shining face of Moses when he descended from the Mount is compared to the glory, not of Christ in his Transfiguration, nor even in heaven,

[1] Num. 21. [2] V.l. "the Lord". [3] Cap. 3. [4] 2 Cor. 3. 7–18.

but to the whole glory of the Christian dispensation, "The Ministration of Righteousness".

VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Much the same is the attitude of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. After showing that Christ is greater than the angels, he goes on to say that he "was counted worthy of more glory than Moses". Christ is the architect of the House of God: Moses is a part of it. Christ is the Son of the House: Moses is a servant in the House. After saying this the writer shows how the Mosaic sacrificial system pointed to the high-priesthood of Christ.

Thus, although Jesus the High Priest, foreshadowed by Melchizedec, is in the foreground of his thought, there is taken for granted the conception of Jesus the second Moses. We see this especially when he is dealing with the old and the new covenants; of these Moses was the mediator of the one, Jesus of the other.

> But now he (Jesus) is the mediator of a better covenant which hath been enacted upon better promises. For if the first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for the second.[1]
>
> Wherefore even the first covenant hath not been dedicated without blood. For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats . . . and sprinkled both the book itself, and the people, saying, "This is the blood of the covenant which God commended to you-ward."[2]

And in the twelfth chapter he contrasts Sinai, "the mount which might be touched and that burned with fire", of which "so fearful was the appearance that Moses said 'I exceedingly fear and quake' ", with "Mount Zion . . . the heavenly Jersualem" to which is gone up "Jesus the mediator of the new Covenant".[3]

VII. ST JOHN

But it is in the Fourth Gospel that we find the implications of this dogma carried out to their fullest. It is not, of course, the principal strand in St John's weaving, but it is one that occurs again and again.

In the Prologue Christ, like Moses, "came unto his own but his own received him not",[4] and the glory of Moses' face after descending from the Mount is remembered when he says, "We beheld his glory . . . full of grace and truth . . . for the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ".[5] In almost the next verse St John Baptist disclaims his own right to be called "that Prophet",[6] and when, still in the first chapter, Philip found Nathanael, allusion is made to the same prophesy of Moses of the "Prophet like unto me" when he says "We have found him of whom Moses in the Law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."[7]

[1] Heb. 8. 6, 7. [2] Ibid., 9. 18–20. [3] Ibid., 12. 18–24. [4] John 1. 11.
[5] John 1. 14–17. [6] John 1. 21, 25. [7] John 1. 45.

In the dialogue with Nicodemus our Lord says, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."[1]

But it is when we come to the sixth and seventh chapters that we see the Mosaic element most clearly. This section is connected with the previous discourse by the words: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father. There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed in me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how will ye believe my words?"[2]

In the sixth chapter, then, we see our Lord first crossing the "sea" of Galilee at about the time of the Passover, the traditional commemoration of the deliverance of Israel, when Moses led Israel through the Red Sea. He goes up into "the Mountain", not alone like the first Moses, but with his disciples. The crowds follow him, and, like Israel in the wilderness, they are hungry.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand follows, reminding them of the manna in the wilderness, so that even the crowd recognizes the second Moses: "Then those men that had seen the sign that Jesus did said, 'This is of a truth that Prophet which should come into the world' ";[3] and remembering that Moses "was king in Jeshurun",[4] they sought to make Jesus king. "When Jesus therefore saw that they would come by force and make him king, he resorted again into the Mountain, himself alone." On the next day he preaches in Capernaum about the Bread of Life, and his text is the Manna in the Wilderness.

In the seventh chapter it is the feast of Tabernacles in Jerusalem. Our Lord again refers the Jews to Moses. Moses gave them the Law, and yet they plotted to kill Jesus. Moses allowed circumcision on the Sabbath, and yet they objected to Jesus healing a man on the Sabbath. But the feast of Tabernacles commemorated the Israelites dwelling in tents in the wilderness. On the last, great day of the feast water was solemnly drawn from the pool of Siloam and poured out of a golden vessel in memory of the water which flowed from the rock which Moses struck.[5] It was on this day that our Lord stood and cried:

"If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink, that believeth on me. As the Scripture hath said, 'Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters.' "[6] It is worth noticing that it is St John who follows this with the description of the pouring of water from the pierced side of Jesus at the Crucifixion.

It should not be forgotten that at one time Moses prayed, "What shall I do to this people, for they be almost ready to stone me?"[7] So St John tells how Jesus on two occasions narrowly escaped stoning.[8]

[1] John 3. 15. [2] John 5. 45. [3] 2. Ex. 16. 14. [4] Deut. 33. 5. Jesherun is a poetical name of Israel. (Dr. I.C.C. Deut. takes this as referring to the kingship of Yahweh.) [5] Ex. 17. 5. [6] John 7. 37–38. The revised punctuation is suggested by Gore in *The Reconstruction of Belief*, p. 631. [7] Ex. 17. 4. [8] John 8. 59 and 10. 31.

Finally, there is the Good Shepherd passage.[1] We are inclined to regard this as an allusion to our Lord as the second David, and to forget that Moses had been a shehperd too, keeping the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, and leading them through the wilderness to Horeb, the Mount of God.[2] Following as it does so much that is Mosaic, it may just as well refer to Moses:

> "Thou leddest thy people like sheep
> By the hand of Moses and Aaron."[3]

VIII. THE APOCALYPSE

In his commentary on the Revelation *A Rebirth of Images*, Dr Austin Farrer displays what is perhaps one of the most surprising illustrations of the subject of this paper.

Dr Farrer has been explaining that the Woman in Rev. 12 is, first, Rachel the mother of Joseph. He then goes on to say:

> We may observe how well the story of the woman fits the theme of the Exodus in all its details. . . . Leviathan lay in wait to destroy the man child of Israel when Moses was born, for Leviathan, the dragon or crocodile of the Nile, is according to Ezekiel (29. 3) a type of Pharaoh and Egypt. But when the mother of Moses "brought forth a man child", he was providentially rapt away into the protection of the throne, to become the saviour of his brethren. Leviathan pursued after the escaping church of Israel, and would have caught her entrammelled in the waters, had not the waters been miraculously swallowed up to allow her passage dry-shod. And so she reaches her "tabernacles", when God also vouchsafed to spread his cloudy tabernacle over her, and declared at the mountain that he had, as St John's vision describes, "lifted her on eagles' pinions to bring her to himself" (Ex. 19. 14).

And on the following page (144) Dr Farrer, after a most interesting exegesis of Isa. 26. 20, continues:

> So for Isaiah, as for St John, the prelude to the preservation in booths and the fall of Leviathan is a mystical travailing of Israel to bring forth Messiah. . . . The snatching of the Man Child to the Throne is actually the resurrection and ascension of Christ.

Thus we can see how Moses was to the apocalyptically minded Christians of the first century the type of Christ.

This seems a suitable place to comment on the rod (ῥάβδος) of Moses which is also the rod of Jesus.

The word has many meanings; it can be a sceptre, a wand of office, a magic wand, the shaft of a spear, a rod for chastisement, and, above all, a rod used by a shepherd. Moses' rod seems to have been most of these. He carried it as a shepherd when he was tending Jethro's sheep. It was transformed into a serpent and back again into a rod. He was told that he was to "do signs" with it. With it he smote the waters of Egypt and turned them into blood. With it he commanded the Red Sea to go back, so that the Children of Israel went through dry-shod. And with it he smote the rock so that waters gushed out.

[1] John 10. [2] Ex. 3. 1. [3] Ps. 77. 20.

Much of this seems to be remembered in the second Psalm. God will give his royal Son the Gentiles (ἔθνη) for his inheritance and will say to him, "Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron." The A.V. gives "Thou shalt break them", but the LXX has ποιμαίνειν, to tend as a shepherd does, the same word as is used by our Lord to St Peter —"Tend my sheep" (John 21. 6). That the rod of a shepherd was by no means always an object of fear we see in the twenty-third Psalm, "Thy rod [ῥάβδος] and thy staff [βακτηρία] comfort me."

Thus it is that as the second Moses Jesus is, in the Revelation, given the rod of a shepherd. Moses had used his rod to herd sheep, to do signs, to overthrow the Gentiles, and to herd the Children of Israel. So of the Man Child in Rev. 12, who is first Moses and then Jesus, it is said that he was to ποιμαίνειν (shepherd or rule) all nations (ἔθνη) with a rod (ῥάβδος) of iron.[1]

IX. EPILOGUE

I did not quite know when I started this investigation where it would lead me. I am not sure that I have yet found out.

It would be a mistake to say that in the mind of our Lord's contemporaries the second Moses was a messianic expectation. Three separate Old Testament figures were expected to return—Elijah, Moses, and David.[2] In St John Baptist they saw the second Elijah, and in Jesus the second Moses and the second David. Our Lord therefore fulfilled two quite separate roles—that of the Prophet *and* the Messiah, the Anointed One, the Christ. Indeed, it is possible that the claim to be that Prophet, the second Moses, was even greater than to be the Christ, the second David. For all the Mosaic *allusions* the Jews never dared to use the name "Moses" itself with reference to Jesus. Ezekiel had not scrupled to call the promised one "David", and the Jews acclaimed Jesus as the "son" or successor of David.[3] But the farthest they dared to go with the other expectation was to call him the Prophet. "This is Jesus,—The Prophet,—Of Nazareth,—Of Galilee", chanted the Galilean peasants as they triumphantly entered Jerusalem.

We Christians can have no conception of the dominance of Moses over the Jewish mind. When every action at every moment of the day was performed in obedience or in disobedience to some precept attributed to him, and when the Torah with its five books, by far the most sacred part of the Canonical Scriptures, were regarded as coming from his pen or from his lips, his figure must have filled the spiritual horizon, at least as much as the figure of Jesus fills the

[1] This argument assumes that the author of the Revelation was using the LXX. In Hebrew ῥαβδον represents two words—(1) *matteh*, a branch of a tree, a rod, or a sceptre. This is the word always used for Moses' rod; (2) *shebet*, a shepherd's club for driving away marauding animals, a rod for punishment, a sceptre, a staff of authority. This is the word used in Pss. 2 and 23 ("Thy *rod* and thy staff comfort me"). As Rev. 12. 5 clearly comes from Ps. 2, it could not allude to Moses if the source is Hebrew.

[2] John 1. 19–23.

[3] Mark 12. 28–37 looks as if our Lord might even have rejected some aspects of the Davidic claim in favour of the Mosaic.

spiritual firmament for a modern Unitarian Christian. To call anyone "the second Moses" would have been as shocking to them as it is for most of us to hear a choir sing that line of Lowell's hymn,

"Some great cause, God's new Messiah,"[1]

To be the second Moses was a far greater demand upon the obedience of Israel than to be that shadowy, dimly perceived figure, the Messiah. It meant the claim to dominate the entire life of his followers. Was not Moses he to whom "Yahweh spoke face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend"?[2] What greater claim could any Jew make? That Moses had for the Jews a form of almost cosmic immensity is shown by the fact that even St Paul could say, "Death reigned from Adam unto Moses." Indeed, it is possible that to be the *second* Moses must itself be a claim to be the greater Moses; for Moses for his single sin had been debarred from entering the Promised Land; but if Jesus was Moses he was a Moses admitted to that sacred soil. That Moses is completely superseded by Jesus is brought out clearly in John 6. 31–40, when the Manna and the True Bread are contrasted.

This claim, then, is undoubtedly a principal part of the earliest Christian teaching, and so far as we can see it is a part of our Lord's view of his own office and work. Moses was the Deliverer of his people, their Shepherd, their Judge, their Lawgiver, their Mediator; and if he did not die for their sins he was ready and willing to do so, for he could pray, "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of the book which thou hast written."[3] Moreover, he established a covenant between the people and God.[4] He instituted the Passover, the prototype of our Eucharist; and the miracles of the Manna and the Smitten Rock speak clearly of him who should come.

There is one curious omission. It is strange that Moses praying on the hill overlooking Rephidim with hands held up by Aaron and Hur, and thereby causing the defeat of the forces of Amalek,[5] is never mentioned by any New Testament writer as prefiguring the Crucifixion, when we see Jesus on the hill of Golgotha, with hands supported by nails driven in by Caiaphas and the Pharisees, and thereby defeating the forces of Satan.

But there is a phrase in St Luke which seems to me very difficult to explain. On the road to Emmaus the Risen Christ said, " 'Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?' And, *beginning at Moses* and all the prophets, he expounded unto them the things concerning himself."[6] It is difficult to see in what way the words or actions of Moses pointed to the passion and resurrection of Christ. The only explanation which I can find is one which has been pointed out to me by the Rev. G. M. V. High. It is this.

In 1922 E. Sellin proposed, like me, to prove that Moses was the

[1] E.H. 563.
[2] Ex. 33. 11.
[3] Ex. 32. 32.
[4] Deut. 29. 10–18.
[5] Ex. 17. 13.
[6] Luke 24. 26, 27.

original of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.[1] His theory is that Moses was murdered by his own people in Shittim following the apostasy of Baal-peor,[2] and despite the efforts of the priests to suppress the sordid story, it nevertheless lived on in prophetic circles. From it Deutero-Isaiah developed the expectation that the once slain leader would return from the dead, lead his people back to the desert, and then announce to all the world the salvation of God. We have reminiscences of this idea in Zech. 11. 4–13. 9. The good Shepherd who is pierced[3] is regarded as Moses. If this hypothesis were true and the tradition of Moses' martyrdom and expected resurrection had lasted to our Lord's day, it would explain much that is obscure. That such an expectation is possible may be seen from the conclusion of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Now the God of peace who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep with the blood of the eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do his will."[4]

CLAUDE CHAVASSE.

(*Concluded*)

Charles Simeon and the Liturgy

IT is generally admitted that Charles Simeon did more than any of his contemporaries to keep the evangelicals within the Church of England. As a considerable section of the evangelical party appears to have moved some way from the great Anglicanism of the evangelical fathers, it is of interest to try to discover the principles which lay behind Simeon's success. Bishop Hensley Henson in the final volume of his Retrospect dismisses him unkindly and unfairly as a very unattractive saint. It is difficult to square this with the apparent attraction he had for the undergraduates of Cambridge during his long ministry and with the sway he held over the Church, which Macaulay described as "far greater than that of any primate". Canon Charles Smyth has shown in his Birkbeck Lectures his great zeal for Church Order and his dislike of irregularities and of Dissent. But in addition to this Simeon seems to have been a man of moderation and sense. His loyalty and love for the Bible and the Prayer Book were not combined with the extremities of literalism, whether that of the purist or the legalist.

His attitude to the Bible is briefly indicated in his preface to *Horae Homileticae*. Here he admits that he is "no friend to systematizers in Theology". His own views are derived from the Scriptures alone, "and to them it is his wish to adhere, with scrupulous fidelity; never wresting any portion of the word of God to favour a particular opinion, but giving to every part of it that sense, which it seems to him to have been designed by its great Author to convey". It is because he is by intention a Biblical theologian that he can stand

[1] North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, pp. 53–5. North does not consider it worth while refuting this theory, and attributes it to a desire to see in the Servant "a ruling figure of semi-Messianic status".

[2] Num. 25. [3] Zech. 12. 10. [4] Heb. 13. 20–21.

apart from the Calvinist-Arminian controversy. The Scripture system "is of a broader and more comprehensive character than some very exact and dogmatical Theologians are inclined to allow". Thus neither Calvinists nor Arminians are in exclusive possession of that system, for "as wheels in a complicated machine may move in opposite directions and yet subserve a common end, so may truths apparently opposite be perfectly reconcilable with each other, and equally subserve the purposes of God in the accomplishment of man's salvation". Dissenters, being tied to a particular system, could be called to task by members of their congregation: not so an Anglican. "No Dissenter dares to preach as I do, one day Calvinist, another day Arminian, just as the text happens to be, for fear his people would take offence." But as an Anglican Simeon's authority was the Scriptures themselves, and these were bigger than any single theological system. Systematizers of any outlook would have recommended St Paul to alter one or other of his expressions, says Simeon, but he is content and would not have one of them altered; he finds as much satisfaction in one class of passages as in another, and he uses both freely. He adds, however, a conviction (surely of value to all friends of Reunion, *mutatis mutandis*) "that pious men, both of the Calvinistic and Arminian persuasion, approximate very nearly when they are upon their knees before God in prayer; the devout Arminian then acknowledging his total dependence upon God, as strongly as the most confirmed Calvinist; and the Calvinist acknowledging his responsibility to God, and his obligation to exertion, in terms as decisive as the most determined Arminian". It is his own wish to become in his writings that which both these individuals are upon their knees.

Further, he criticizes the habit of some expositors who pervert the Scripture "to make it refer to Christ and his salvation, when no such object appears to have been in the contemplation of the inspired writer". This springs from "an ultra-Evangelical taste, which overlooks in many passages the *practical* lessons they were intended to convey, and detects in them only the leading *doctrines* of the Gospel". In Simeon's view the lessons of morality were (in their place) as useful and important as the doctrines of grace. [It is perhaps significant in this connexion to note that R. W. Dale in his celebrated sermon on the Evangelical Revival remarks that it had no ethical originality, adding that the true ethical spirit of Protestantism had never attained a complete and harmonious development.] Simeon pleaded for a return to the practice of expounding the Scriptures as the Reformers had urged, and his own numerous discourses are all true to this ideal. He is anxious, however, that this should not be done in a desultory manner; concentration should be upon the leading point of the passage and the subordinate parts noticed only in so far as they throw additional light on that. This is not unlike George Herbert's advice: "The parson's method in handling of a text consists of two parts: first, a plain and evident declaration of the meaning of the text; and secondly, some choice observations drawn out of the whole text, as it lies entire and unbroken in

the Scripture itself. This he thinks natural, and sweet, and grave. Whereas the other way, of crumbling a text into small parts, as the person speaking or spoken to, the subject and object, and the like, hath neither in it sweetness, nor gravity, nor variety; since the words apart are not Scripture, but a dictionary, and may be considered alike in all the Scripture."

During the month of November 1811 Simeon was induced to preach four sermons before the university of Cambridge on "The Excellency of the Liturgy". These were elicited by a pamphlet written by Dr Marsh, the Lady Margaret Professor, entitled "Inquiry respecting the neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible", a criticism of the recently formed British and Foreign Bible Society. The promoters of the Society had been accused of Calvinism and therefore of only a loose attachment to the English Liturgy. Simeon, though no Calvinist, was determined to defend the evangelical and missionary-minded clergy from such an unjust charge: hence this brief course of sermons.

The text on which each of them is based is Deut. 5. 28–29: "They have well said all that they have spoken: O that there were such an heart in them!" The context, of course, refers to the fear of the children of Israel before the majesty of the Lord revealed on Mount Sinai. The first sermon is devoted to a straightforward exposition and application of the meaning of the passage. The theme is that transient sentiments must be turned into permanent dispositions and not be allowed to pass when the alarming circumstances which rouse them no longer obtain. In this passage there are three such sentiments on which the preacher dwells: an acknowledgment that they could not stand before the divine majesty, a desire for a mediator and their promise of obedience. He then shows that these must become inherent dispositions such as God always desires to find in his children, namely a reverential fear, which far from being destructive of happiness is creative of it, a love to Jesus our Mediator, and an unfeigned delight in his commandments.

The other sermons expound the text in an "accommodated sense" with reference to our requests to God in the Liturgy of the Established Church. The second sermon is the most important for our present purpose. Our English Liturgy, says Simeon, "is a composition of unrivalled excellence and needs only the exercise of our devout affections to render it a most acceptable service before God". He proceeds to defend the use of liturgical forms as both lawful and expedient. It is lawful because God prescribed the use of forms of prayer for the Jewish nation (Num. 6. 23–26; 1 Chron. 16. 7–36); the psalms were all used as devotional forms; and Jesus taught a form of prayer. Even those opposed to the liturgy used forms, because hymns were also forms in this sense. "If it be lawful to worship God in forms of verse, is it not equally so in forms of prose?"

But the use of a liturgy is expedient. This was so at the time of the Reformation and remains so still. It was expedient at the Reformation because it dispelled ignorance. Without the Prayer Book the people of England would still be in spiritual darkness, but

through it "every part of the kingdom became in a good measure irradiated with Scriptural knowledge and with saving truth". It was a standard of piety of inestimable worth, and it has served "to perpetuate the flame which the Lord himself, at the time of the Reformation, kindled upon our altars". Turning to the present, the preacher asserts that "to lead the devotions of a congregation in extempore prayer is a work for which but few are qualified". Those ministers who have to lead worship without a suitable form must often wish that they had one. For it secures us against tedious repetitions. Moreover, if anyone finds the liturgy dull and formal, "let him only examine his frame of mind when engaged in extemporaneous prayers, whether in public or in his own family; and he will find that his formality is not confined to the service of the Church, but is the sad fruit and consequence of his own weakness and corruption". Spiritual edification comes from solid truths, not fluent words. It consists in humility of mind and a more holy and consistent walk with God. This is "more valuable than all the animal fervour that ever was excited". The charms of novelty in extempore praying are delusive, but the prayer of faith, whether with or without form, shall never go forth in vain. "Thousands have found God as present with them in the use of the public services of our Church as ever they did in their secret chambers".

Attention is then turned to objections raised against the liturgy, and particularly to certain expressions to which exception had been taken. "To notice all the expressions which captious men have cavilled at, would be a waste of time", but one or two have had considerable weight with tender minds. He mentions two. The first concerns the optimistic assumptions of the Burial Service. Some apparently found difficulty in expressing the sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life over one who had possibly died in his sins. Simeon defends the prayer by pointing out that we speak not of *his* resurrection but of *the* resurrection, adding that we do not absolutely know that God has *not* pardoned a person, and we may certainly hope that he has. St Paul in his epistles often commended all, when in strictness of speech (according to the critics) he should have made some particular exceptions.

The second objection, as we might expect, concerns the Baptismal Service. We thank God for having regenerated the baptized infant by his Holy Spirit. Simeon's answer proceeds along these lines. Our Reformers appear to have held that regeneration and remission of sins did accompany Baptism. This, however, quite definitely did not mean that there was no need for the baptized person to grow up and bring forth fruit, "or that he could be saved in any other way than by a progressive renovation of his soul after the Divine image". For having declared the child to be regenerate, we continue by praying "that he being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin". To the Anglican Reformers, then, regeneration did not mean a total change of *nature*; it was a change of *state*. Confusion had come in that since their days the

term "regeneration" had been used to express that "total change both of heart and life" which evangelicals were accustomed to look for in conversion. The question, he suggests, is not whether a baptized person can be saved by that ordinance alone without sanctification, but whether God always accompanies the sign with the thing signified. There must be room for difference of opinion, for we can only judge by the fruits that follow. Those who scruple at the Baptismal Service have equal cause for scruple at St Paul's words in Gal. 3. 27, "As many of you as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ", and similarly Acts 2. 38–39 and 1 Pet. 3. 21. "Let me speak the truth before God; though I am no Arminian, I do think that the refinements of Calvin have done great harm in the Church. . . . The less addicted any person is to systematic accuracy, the more he will accord with the inspired writers." Simeon, like Wilberforce, believed in Baptismal Regeneration, but not in unconditional regeneration.

He concludes by dismissing the charge of formality made against the Liturgy. "If any person come to the service of the Church with a truly spiritual mind, he will find in our Liturgy what is calculated to call forth the devoutest exercise of his mind, far more than any of the extemporaneous prayers which he would hear in other places." Dissenters repeat hymns without generating formality: so we our Liturgy.

The remaining two sermons are less detailed. The third extols the excellence of the Liturgy. As a result of its successive revisions "it has been brought to such a state of perfection, as no human composition of equal size and variety can pretend to". He draws attention to: 1. Its spirituality and purity: all its services are centred in Christ. "From our very birth even to the grave our Church omits nothing that can tend to the edification of its members." 2. Its fullness and suitableness: "There is no possible situation in which we can be placed but the prayers are precisely suited to us; nor can we be in any frame of mind, wherein they will not express our feelings as strongly and forcibly as any person could express them even in his secret chamber." 3. Its moderation and candour: the compilers do not dwell on doctrines after the manner of human systems. "In no place have moderation and candour shone more conspicuous than in this distinguished seat of literature and science." Despite this he admits that the liturgy is not perfect, simply because it is a human composition. He does not like the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed. Of the damned he says: "I would rather deplore the curse that awaits them than denounce it, and rather weep over them in my secret chamber than utter anathemas against them in the house of God." "All that is wanting is an heart suited to the Liturgy and cast as it were into that mould. . . . Let us only suppose that on any particular occasion there were in all of us such a state of mind as the Liturgy is suited to express, what glorious worship would ours be! and how certainly would God delight to hear and bless us!"

The fourth and final sermon is an exposition of the Ordinal, for

the Church of England took care to see that its Liturgy was in the hands of well-qualified ministers. So he addresses himself to the clergy, reminding them of their professions and promises, and the people of the importance of their prayers for the ministry. People's prejudices are in general in favour of the Established Church, though "some indeed would entertain prejudices against it, even if all the twelve Apostles were members of it and ministered to it; but, in general, it is a want of zeal in its ministers, and not any want of purity in its institutions, that gives such an advantage to Dissenters". He ends by urging that no occasions should be given to men to seek for that in other places, which is so richly provided for them in their own Church, and warning the clergy "that the Liturgy itself will appear against us in judgment, if we labour not to the utmost of our power to fulfil the engagements which we have voluntarily entered into."

DOUGLAS WEBSTER.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Hodgson is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and a Canon of Christ Church.

The Rev. P. S. Watson is Tutor in Systematic Theology at Handsworth College and a Recognized Lecturer in the University of Birmingham.

The Rev. C. Chavasse is Vicar of Kidlington, Oxford.

The Rev. D. Webster is Tutor of the London College of Divinity.

CORRESPONDENCE

FUNERALS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The article of the Rev. Eric Wild raises several important issues, and it would be tempting to cross swords with him over a number of them. But I should like to endorse emphatically his contention that some of the additions in the 1928 Burial Office (and by implication the whole tendency of modern streamlined methods of burial) serve only to "divert attention away from the matter in hand, which is the burial of a Christian, to the emotions of the mourners". Cremation in particular seems to be deliberately designed to eliminate the fact of death altogether. Soft electronic bells or music, the coffin smoothly gliding out of sight, the well-kept garden where ashes may be scattered but never an honest clod of clay is seen, make it all so beautiful, all so unreal. There is no pastoral or evangelistic opportunity in these conditions. The Gospel cannot be presented on a basis of unreality. We must have the stark reality of death before we can preach the resurrection.

But is it not true that the real work of a priest in the burial of

the dead is not to look for "opportunities" but to get on with the job of burying the Christian, which is indispensable and distinctively priestly whether there are any mourners present or not? This means that where the whole thing is regarded as comfort for the bereaved (as in cremation) there is a real danger of the priestly work not being carried out at all. I contend that this danger has not been avoided in the adaptation of the Burial Office for a cremation, so that, while I have no objection to cremation in principle, I submit that as it is done at present it can hardly be called Christian burial at all.

The priestly work in burial rests on the New Testament doctrine of man redeemed by Christ and made a partaker of the Holy Spirit. Man is a body-soul baptized into the name of Christ. Our Lord arose in his human body as the firstfruits of all creation. Consequently belief in the resurrection of the body implies not only the new celestial body which we shall put on after death, but also the ultimate recapitulation of the dust and ashes of our mortal bodies, along with all creation, into the fullness of Christ. The whole personality is holy, not the soul only. In the funeral service the priest is offering the whole earthly life of the whole personality to the Father through the death and resurrection of the Son, to be cleansed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Here then is a priestly work which is essential in itself quite apart from any ministrations to the mourners. His work for the soul is contained in the prayers, which are usually included in the service in church, and are fittingly supplemented by a Requiem Mass (*pace* Mr Wild). His work for the body is contained in the burial, which is the reverent disposal of the human flesh, which under the Christian dispensation has been the temple of the Holy Ghost. That is why it is so important that a priest should be present when the body is laid to rest. At his word the earth is first thrown into the grave, and the filling in continues immediately after the committal until there is no possibility of disrespect to the dead. In fact the committal requires the same care and reverence as we give when we dispose of the remains of the Sacred Elements in the Holy Eucharist.

And it is the same reason which makes cremation completely unsatisfactory. For however well the priest does his job of offering the soul of the dead in the prayers, his equally important job of disposing of the body is a mere farce. As he says the words of committal he simply presses a button and the coffin disappears to a waiting room until such time as the furnace is heated sufficiently. And of course the scandals which have actually taken place between the committal and the cremation are well known. But even when such things are eliminated by the careful provisions of the crematorium authorities, the fact remains that the words of committal are meaningless. They are nothing more than the mourners' farewell to the body, whereas their concern is really with the body, whether there are mourners or not. This fact has been completely lost sight of in cremation.

It follows that the only satisfactory way of lining up words and

actions in cremation is to place the coffin into the furnace while the anthem "Man that is born", etc., is being said. Then the action during the words of committal, corresponding to casting in earth, might be the closing of the oven doors. Perhaps this may be considered a sight too horrifying for the mourners. In that case let them stop away from it, but at least let the priest do his proper work for the body. The directors of crematoria would probably say that this is impossible and impracticable. If so, I submit that they have not yet found a way of providing for Christian burial by the method of cremation.

Yours faithfully,

FREDERICK C. LINDARS,
Assistant Curate.

ST LUKE'S VICARAGE,
PALLION,
SUNDERLAND.
12 *May* 1951.

P.S.—The above remarks may perhaps be felt to be severe and to neglect the equally priestly duty of ministering to the mourners. That is not intended, of course, but I think that great care and reverence in disposing of the human remains is more likely to convey the Christian hope at a deep level than many words of comfort.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Many will welcome the Rev. Eric Wild's suggestion about the evangelistic use of funerals, but it is difficult to follow his teaching about the message to be given.

He objects to the phrase "called to higher service". Dr Goudge's comment on 1 Pet. 3. 18—4. 6 is that "it suggests that for saints departed, as for our Lord after Good Friday, an evangelistic activity may be possible". Fr E. L. Strong writes: "Christ's work and therefore, we may be sure, the work of his Church goes on in the place of the departed".

Mr Wild believes souls "sleep in Jesus" apparently till the last day. It is precisely this notion which accounts for the apathetic attitude of so many churchgoers to the beyond. Sleep, for them, is equivalent to unconsciousness and the last day too far off to be of any inspiration. 2 Cor. 5. 1–10 is variously interpreted, but there is a strong and convincing school which maintains that a real spiritual body is either bestowed at death or developed during this life. Fr Strong writes of the saints: "It is surely impossible to suppose that their nature is still in a maimed state—that they are without their bodies." This is supported by "realized eschatology": death, burial, and resurrection, are processes now going on: for the saints these processes may be finished at death: for most of us they must continue in the beyond and we shall welcome the prayers and eucharistic intercession of the Church on our behalf. This view of the spiritual body is supported by psychic research and also by the school of scientists which questions the whole terminology of soul and body. Man is made up of energy and spirit organized in different ways on earth, in the intermediate state, and in heaven, but continuously.

The true evangelism surely maintains the vision of God, of Christ; the society of the saints and the joy of higher service can be mine in a few years if I press forward. No doubt my sins will retard the realization of these things, but at least the more I do here the less there will be for me to do in the beyond. Death should indeed be "the gate of life immortal".

I am, Sir,
Yours truly,
G. E. Hewson.

St George's Vicarage,
Truro.

THE MEANING OF *ὑπόστασις*

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In the May Theology Mr Blakeney writes that one of the most difficult words in Greek adequately to translate seems to be *ὑπόστασις*. May I suggest that this difficulty arises because of the changes that have occurred in our habits of thought?

The English word that appears to be directly derived from *ὑπόστασις* is "understanding"; but this word is not usually used as a translation and does not appear in Mr Blakeney's list of meanings. This, perhaps, is because in the last few centuries we have grown into the habit of thinking that the one and only place of "understanding" is the human mind, whereas *ὑπόστασις* has to apply to things and events outside our minds. Ancient and medieval writers, on the other hand, saw "understanding" or "substance" in all created things and situations.

It is interesting to notice that our common parlance confirms the Greek point of view. We still speak of "an ingenious building", "a clever machine", or even "a sensible dress", in spite of the fact that we have been brought up to think that only a man can be sensible. We also use the word "substance" in its ancient sense when we speak of "the substance of a book", or use a phrase such as "animals and plants are substantially similar".

The changes in metaphysics which are now occurring, notably at Oxford, seem to remove "understanding" from its nebulous position in the mind, and place it in behaviour, speech, writing, and in made things. I should like to suggest that, with these changes, *ὑπόστασις* (excepting its Nicene use) can have once again a clear meaning.

Gilbert Walton.

Abingdon, Berks.

THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In the March issue of Theology you featured an article on the subject "Modern Sects in the American West". My sect, The Church of the Nazarene, was grouped with two other "holiness"

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL

bodies, and almost everything said about it was either misleading or incorrect. At least four descriptions were in the latter category. I shall mention only them.

It was stated that we "speak with tongues". Our Church everywhere discountenances that religious phenomenon.

Of our teaching the author said, "There is no falling away, no lapse from grace." Probably no other doctrine is opposed by us so much as is this one.

We are represented as teaching that "the 'post-conversion sinner' never was a true convert". Since we do not teach the doctrine immediately above, we do not need to teach this one.

We are said to teach that "dancing and card-playing rank with adultery". That makes good reading matter, but it is not true. We do not dance and we do not play cards, but those acts are not by us ranked with adultery.

Having said we do not teach the above, I might mention what we do affirm. Our theology is an Arminian-Wesleyan brand of the great, central doctrines of historic Christianity. Our two distinguishing beliefs are the two most characteristic teachings of John Wesley: heart purity or entire sanctification—a work of grace subsequent to regeneration—and assurance, or the witness of the Spirit both to regeneration and heart purity.

I might also add a few statements which will let you know what my "sect" is accomplishing. Ours happens to be one of the fastest-growing of all Protestant denominations. Every thirty-six hours, in America alone, we organize a new congregation into a church and place a pastor in charge. After forty-two years of history, we have spread to more than thirty countries. In 1950 more than 200,000 ministers and laymen were engaged in personal evangelism through visitation. We have more than 4,500 students in our accredited college in America alone. Our central graduate seminary in Kansas City, Missouri, is about sixth or seventh largest of the 184 seminaries in America. In 1950 we printed 29 million pieces of Christian literature. We have a world-wide radio broadcast which is heard each week over 288 stations. Because of its popularity, 136 stations carry it free of charge. It comes to Britain via Radio Luxembourg. We have more than twice as many enrolled in our Sunday schools as we have in our Church membership, which we think is evidence of health as a denomination. In 1950 our *per capita* giving was £37. 6s. 2d., which is the highest of the twenty-five denominations in America which comprise the National Stewardship Council.

I am an American Ph.D. research student in Trinity College, Glasgow University, and teach part-time in Hurlet Nazarene College, Glasgow, where my Church is training young men for the Christian ministry.

I wish you every success in your work.

Respectfully yours,

J. Kenneth Grider.

17 *May* 1951.

TENT-MAKERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The doctrine of the priesthood attributed to me by Mr Bennett is indeed extraordinary. But it is his invention, not mine. It had never occurred to me until I read his remarks. I believe, and have always believed, that the priest is responsible for every member of the community in which he works, whether Christian or not, and that, in theory at least, it is to the whole that he ministers at the altar. My unlucky sentence only meant that, in the present case, the priest would probably be ordained to celebrate for a community not the same as that in which his pastoral responsibility lies. The distinction need not be geographical: it may be that the two spheres, while existing in the same place, are composed partly or wholly of different people. A probation officer's responsibility towards respectable maiden ladies, for instance, is rather indirect. And the point is that ordination for the purpose of celebrating in a community for which pastoral responsibility cannot be accepted implies a divorce between the pastoral and liturgical functions of the priesthood.

That the responsibility is shared by the whole Church is true, but not quite relevant. It is not *exclusively* the concern of the curate, but it is his concern, nevertheless. Also, undoubtedly the non-professional priests would bear excellent Christian witness at their work even where the jobs themselves have no pastoral value. But that is not the same as carrying out the function of a priest. It is too incidental. For the priest, pastoral-evangelistic work must have absolute priority over secular duties, whereas the secular worker should give priority to his job. A priest is primarily a priest, and a spinner primarily a spinner. It is only when the job itself can be regarded as part of the priestly office that this opposition does not arise.

I am unrepentant about the phrase "massing priests". The men themselves would not be in any way unprofitable, but their priesthood would be "massing" in the sense that their ordination would be little more than the granting of permission to celebrate the Eucharist. Such a view is fundamentally contrary to the Anglican doctrine of the priesthood, and any measure that implies it, however convenient, must be absolutely forbidden.

Yours faithfully,
R. C. BARSLEY.

2, KING STREET,
HEYWOOD,
LANCS.

11 *June* 1951.

BOOK REVIEWS

MORALS AND REVELATION. By H. D. Lewis. Allen and Unwin. 16s.

In this book Professor Lewis has brought together a number of articles and papers prepared for a variety of occasions, arranged now to bring out an impressively developing theme, and marked throughout by the religious interest, the clarity of thought, and the concern for ethical integrity, which we have learned to associate with his

writings. The result is a most acceptable sequel to the author's earlier work, *Morals and the New Theology*, and, moreover, a sequel in which the general direction of his religious thought is more clearly apparent.

Although he has often criticized Barthianism and the new Protestantism in general, Professor Lewis is well aware of the genuine strength which resides in its salutary emphasis upon the transcendence, the "otherness", of God. In this indeed it is prophetic; but in its present form it has mingled this important insight with much distortion and contradiction of ordinary moral conviction. In his earlier book the author's main purpose was to expose ethical confusion in the theological camp and to condemn indifference to the impressive progress which ethics has recently achieved in the understanding of the objectivity of moral standards. To this theme he now returns in his opening chapters, and all that he says deserves the most serious consideration by students of theology, although some will doubtless think that the total rejection of the idea of collective responsibility does scant justice to the type of situation in which the moral significance of A's behaviour and B's does not reside simply in what precisely each performs, but rather in the character of the joint enterprise to which both are committed, to which both contribute by their separate actions, and for which surely they share the responsibility. Just as it seems idle to try to assess the respective moves of two players in a game of draughts without reference to the rules and aims of the game and the joint decision to play this game, so there might arise a situation in which the principal moral interest centred, not on the honesty or otherwise of their respective play, but on the fact that they had jointly chosen to play draughts on such-and-such an occasion.

Later Professor Lewis discusses the neglect of ethics by professional philosophers and even, in spite of a great deal of good work accomplished, the neglect by moralists of the problem of freedom and responsibility; but, although there is much that stimulates thought in this part of the book, especially the careful analysis of the kind of freedom presupposed by the idea of guilt and the clear-headed examination of what is implied by those explanations of guilt in naturalistic terms which many psychologists favour, these matters, from the theological standpoint, belong rather to supporting movements than to the main line of advance.

What theologians will be most anxious to learn is where the argument is leading, and how, according to Professor Lewis, religion must appear when ethical confusion has been eradicated from the theological account of it and religious thought has "mounted to the level of our other attainments"; and here an important point is that Professor Lewis blames both Barthianism and most traditional theology, not simply for the perpetration of ethical blunders, but for the mistaken introduction of any ethical concepts and considerations at all where they are inappropriate. He regards the problem of how the transcendent God can reveal himself to men as the hardest and most important problem in the philosophy of religion;

but it is an epistemological problem, and more than once he complains about the introduction into this question of "a whole body of alien ethical conceptions, to the great confusion of ethics and theory of knowledge" (p. 218; cf. pp. 20, 33, 220, 228). In place of an account of revelation and religious knowledge which is shot through and through with moral meaning, Professor Lewis argues for a more severely epistemological statement of the case which finds an important analogy in art and in its symbolic awareness of reality in a manner which defies rational analysis. Not that moral considerations are rigidly excluded. They have a bearing upon the question of revelation. There is a moral side to the matter, perhaps even moral conditions of religious experience; but it is only a confused theory which allows moral ideas at the centre. All this is ably argued and finely expressed, and the reading of it a profitable adventure. None the less, the question remains, Is the author's conclusion true? Is not the work of Christ inalienably a work, not of enlightenment only, but of salvation? Is there not a sphere, and that the sphere of religion, where to know is to serve, where in fact ethics and epistemology refuse to be put asunder?

This is a book which deals with crucial issues in contemporary thought, and many will wait expectantly for the fuller statement of the author's theory of religious truth promised in the Preface.

Rothesay, Isle of Bute. N. H. G. Robinson.

The Foundations of the Christian Faith. By J. N. Sanders. A. and C. Black. 10s. 6d.

Mr Sanders, Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, has written an interesting and valuable book. The book, which owes its origin to a course of popular lectures, discusses New Testament teaching in the light of historical criticism. Mr Sanders points out that his presuppositions differ fundamentally from those of Bishop Barnes in his *Rise of Christianity*, and he writes to explain his reasons for disagreeing with the contentions of that book. His aim is to give a brief exposition of the fundamental beliefs of Christians, and for this purpose he discusses the Apostolic *kerygma* and the significance of the Gospels thereto; and, in this connexion, he considers also the life and teaching of Jesus and the work of the first Christian theologians, St Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist. Christianity, he soundly maintains, is a historical religion, in the sense that it affirms the reality of the life of Jesus and of a unique relation between him and God. Among the presuppositions which, in his view, are essential for purposes of historical criticism, first place is given to the belief that God has intervened in the world of nature and history "with surprising, unpredictable, and unparalleled results".

A useful and illuminating survey is given of the principles of interpretation, from those of Irenaeus and Luther to those followed in modern times by Spinoza, Schleiermacher, Jowett, and the protagon-

ists of liberal theology. With Dr Barnes, Mr Sanders agrees that there is no opposition between science and scholarship, but, in his opinion, the bishop has substituted for science "a highly questionable philosophy, naturalistic and materialistic in the extreme, which claims the support of science, but which is rather a specimen of the 'science falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith', against which the author of 1 Timothy protests". I must confess that to a non-episcopal reader this castigation of a bishop seems rather shocking, and perhaps it would have been better if this apologetic interest had been given independent treatment. Mr Sanders goes so far to accuse the bishop of idolatry, inasmuch as in his worship of Jesus "he is worshipping a figment of his own imagination".

It is a special merit of the book that it examines so fully the relationship between the Gospels and the Apostolic *kerygma*. The general position adopted is that, while the Gospels contain many discrepancies, difficulties, and inconsistencies, they are reliable witnesses, if we have regard to their intrinsic character and to the congruity between their teaching and the faith of the Church as it is reflected in the Epistles and the Creeds. "If Jesus had not been very much as the Synoptic Gospels depict him, then there would have been no Church to construct a 'Christ of faith' different from the 'historical Jesus', no Evangelists to record their construction—and no possibility of discovering any 'historical Jesus' either" (p. 104). This contention has much force, but it does not free the critic from the necessity to consider how far the record is affected by the conditions which influence all human testimony, especially in respect of the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection narratives, and the accounts of "nature" miracles. In short, it may be that current rejoicings over the demise of the liberal critical movement are somewhat premature, and that a reconciliation is yet to be sought between it and the credal emphasis of to-day.

Mr Sanders's book is to be welcomed in that he shows that neither Fundamentalism nor radical criticism is necessary for the uncovering of the foundations of the Christian faith. The essential criterion, he rightly holds, is the congruity of any particular part of the Biblical relevation with the message of the Bible as a whole. With much distinction, Mr Sanders has combined the task of making his theme luminous and relevant for the general reader with that of pointing the more advanced student to problems and presuppositions which he needs to examine further.

Wesley College, Leeds. Vincent Taylor.

Socinianism in Seventeenth-century England. By H. John McLachlan. Oxford University Press. 25s.

This is a well-documented and informative study which will place students of seventeenth-century English religion in the author's debt. Despite the period's stern proscription of Socinian opinions with the consequent difficulty in following trails half-hidden or purposely ob-

literated, Dr McLachlan has traced a pattern of personalities, ideas, and events. This was no light task, for the path travels through secret coteries, heresy hunts, imprisonments and book-burnings, so that we encounter the concealed Unitarianism of Newton, and the tacit antitrinitarianism of Locke as well as John Bidle, who suffered for the open avowal of his beliefs. The story has added interest because Socinianism being more a trend or attitude of mind in England than a movement or a church as in Poland, we are led on past the secret press and the constant smuggling of books from Holland, to the point where some Anglicans savoured the bouquet of the Belgic wine although their latitudinarianism seems to have been the measure of their indebtedness to Faustus Socinus and his followers. Dr McLachlan has not succumbed to the temptation of making too much of the apparent connexion between the English philosophical divines and Socinian liberalism and toleration, being aware that there is such a thing as the spontaneous combustion of ideas. Where we are translated to the realm of sectaries and independents we can at once admire their honesty and appreciate Sanderson's tart remark about people who desire "to conclude the Holy Catholic Church within the back-parlours of a house or two in Amsterdam". But with the rationalist theology of the Socinian writers we are in modern if not modernist surroundings. Indeed, the ethos of the movement owes more to the Renaissance than to the Reformation, and their rationalism belongs to the Age of Reason rather than with the scholastic rationalism which Hooker made his own. He "who only Hooker knows" will miss the significant fact that through the Amsterdam bridge-head there was penetrating something quite alien to contemporary Anglicanism, to orthodox dissent, and to the biblicism of certain sects, something which was nothing less than the beginnings of modern empiricism. Bidle's blithe dismissal of the language of theology as "the new Babel" and its concepts as "fitter for Conjurors than Christians" was an utterance of the genuine Socinianism, but its views on the Trinity and the Atonement made little impression, while the eirenic appeal to reason and toleration chimed with and possibly influenced the views of the Oxford rational theologians and the Cambridge Platonists. Both schools displayed the rational and seeking approach to religion of Chillingworth and acknowledged with Whichcote that vitals in religion are few. Set over against them was a theory of Church and State which by its high ranking of orthodoxy and unity could see censorship as a necessary protection of the *res publica*. Laud's "nihil obstat", and its equivalent in other countries, was not so much the product of what moderns would term bigotry as the logical outcome of a theory of Church and State, not yet extinct, which considered it worth while in these interests to control the individual. Under the Commonwealth the same view obtained, with different emphases. The truth is that side by side with Socinian notions in religion, if not always directly connected with them, there was walking not what the seventeenth-century meant by democracy but the beginnings of the modern article. In respect of its humanism, Socinianism, which was

never allowed to reach the stage of being a gathered church in the England of the period, was symptomatic of profound changes to come. Of considerable interest is the chapter on the distribution of Socinian literature, and the author's conjecture that a search of older libraries would reveal a large number of Socinian books can be corroborated in the case of at least one Irish cathedral library (Cashel). This collection has Socinus, Schlichtingius (both published "Irenopoli"), Volkelius, J. Crellius ("Eleutheropoli"), Episcopius, Poole, Ruar, and Stephen Nye. Together with Chewney's "Anti-Socinianism" are Edward's "Gangraena", Estwick's "Examination", Owen's "Pneumatologia", and even Featley's "The Dippers Dipt" written against Elias Tookey's little antitrinitarian secession from the Baptists.

Dr McLachlan's book is a contribution to the history of religious freedom and to the better understanding of seventeenth-century England.

H. R. McAdoo.
Bantry,
Co. Cork.

From Puritanism to the Age of Reason: A Study of Changes in Religious Thought within the Church of England, 1660-1700. By G. R. Cragg. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

Many a slim volume has been described as having "an importance out of all proportion to its size". Occasionally, however, one meets with a small unpretentious book for which this formal commendation seems quite inadequate: one which, for all its modest proportions, leaves the reader with a feeling of deep satisfaction, because it is distinguished not only by the nature of its theme and the competence of its scholarship, but also (what is much rarer) by the *charm* of its presentation. For the present reviewer, one small book of this kind was Mr E. G. Rupp's *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition*, for part of which the author had been awarded the Archbishop Cranmer Prize in 1940. Another is this slightly longer work, in the same format, by Dr Cragg, and it is interesting to find that this also originated in an essay submitted more recently for the same prize. It has been undertaken not with an uncritical admiration for the period with which it deals, but with a conviction that its importance exceeds the attention it has so far received.

It is a commonplace to remark that the seventeenth century is the watershed which divides medieval from modern times. But, as Dr Cragg emphasizes, the transition is to be discerned most clearly in the years between the Restoration and the death of Queen Anne. True, there have been tremendous changes since the opening decades of the eighteenth century, and yet "there is no gulf between [that] age and ours such as divides the present day from the times of Charles I or Cromwell". Already, before the seventeenth century closed, "the men whose works were moulding religious thought were indebted to Newton for their understanding of the world and to Locke for their interpretation of man's relation to it. Their outlook was, in embryo at least, the outlook of the modern age."

Is it possible to select one dominant characteristic of that transitional period? It would be absurd to suggest that there had been a failure to recognize the place of reason in religion before the Restoration; the most important single feature in the religious thought of the forty years with which Dr Cragg is particularly concerned was not so much a recognition of the rightful place of reason, it was rather the gradual *ascendancy* of reason (very variously interpreted) over every other kind of authority; and although much of what Dr Cragg has to say about it is not new, in the sense that some of the persons, groups, and movements discussed, have received individual treatment from other scholars, one of the great merits of his book lies in the masterly way in which their several contributions to this ascendancy of "reason", the "reasonable", and the "scientific", are taken and built up to form a comprehensive picture. An account of the decline of Calvinism, with special reference to the writings of Robert Sanderson, leads on to an examination of the ideas and ideals of the Cambridge Platonists (of whom Dr Cragg is especially appreciative) and the Latitudinarians, and also of the impact of the new science. A separate chapter is devoted to the religious significance of John Locke, and another to John Toland and the rise of Deism. Finally there are two chapters of a general nature: one to trace the course and indicate the religious consequences of the far-reaching changes of political fact and political theory; and another to show the growth and acceptance of toleration, not only as an idea but as a practical feature of the English scene.

The eighteenth century, said Bartholo in the *Barber of Seville*, "has produced liberty of thought, magnetism, electricity, toleration, vaccination, quinine, the Encyclopaedia, a few plays—in fact every kind of foolishness". And, as J. M. Thompson once commented, there was a grain of seriousness in the satire. Beaumarchais, however, was a Frenchman, and could hardly be expected to include in his list what Dr Cragg calls "the thin and superficial plausibility of eighteenth-century theology". Doubtless there were things to admire in "the cool and disengaged propriety of eighteenth-century enlightenment". But one need not be an "enthusiast" to think that something vital had been lost when, even for so many of the professedly religious, God was only a final term in a logical demonstration, revelation simply an interesting though somewhat superfluous means of information, and faith (as Toland said) nothing more than "a firm persuasion built upon substantial reasons".

MANSFIELD. THOMAS WOOD.

THE MAGIC PEOPLE. By Arland Ussher. Gollancz. 10s. 6d.

"There is", Mr Ussher writes, "a Jewish problem for the same reason that there is a Christian problem—because they are in truth the two halves of the same problem." The statement does not sound particularly cogent, but it may bring Christians to realize that they do not consciously think about Jews enough. They tend to forget the fact to which the eighteenth-century modernizer of Judaism,

Moses Mendelssohn, alluded when he was pressed to receive baptism and he retorted that the foundations of his house were not giving way, but that if they were he would not seek refuge on the first floor. We tend to forget the fact that Christianity is built on Judaism. Like that anecdote, Mr Ussher's book is a reminder; for the Jews are the people of its title. They are said to be a deadly subject. If so, he has galvanized it. We not only owe it to ourselves to read on this subject from time to time; we shall find reading this book stimulating and agreeable for the most part.

I do not mean that we are likely to approve much that it says. Rather, our recurring disagreement with it will disclose to us that on this subject which we ostensibly neglect we actually hold decided opinions. As regards the first two chapters, so much is obvious; for the one is concerned with the Old Testament, the other with the New. Later, towards the end of the volume, Mr Ussher remarks, "I am a Christian writing for Christians." To the extent the words go beyond indicating that he himself is not a Jew, they mislead. In Chapter Two he has said, even more ingenuously, that the brand of Christianity he professes is "undenominational". Not only is he oblivious to the phantasmal nature of this, but also, while straining at gnats of Christian dogma, he swallows over and over again the camel of Freudian psychology. The result is necessarily something no denominational Christian will recognize. What can be the probability on which he confidently insists that he has divined the thoughts of our Lord on the eve of the Crucifixion? Never before nor since has a scapegoat been sacred, he adds as though consolingly. He invites being told, "Aren't you forgetting Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico*?"

In the third chapter he sweeps a glance over the Jewish lot down the ages of Christendom, and the sweep is too rapid. For instance, it hardly takes in the implications of the life of Frankfort in the time of Reuchlin. With the rapidity goes a hyper-Hibernian laxness of thought which allows him to attribute to a type the behaviour of an individual. The fourth chapter is a denunciation, more vigorous and fanciful than eloquent, of the anti-Semite. It is rather boring. As for the solution which he offers at the last of the Jewish problem in the West, that is like asking the Roman Church to concede for the sake of reunion.

In sum, Mr Ussher is as dogmatic as a reviewer and steadily wrong-headed, but how could he practise the virtue of constantly having something to say and be right every time? He is extremely pleasant to disagree with. He combines freshness with charm. Witness the passage: "The prophet Hosea, who sees in his tender patience with an erring spouse the relations of the Unseen with Man, shows a depth which we should seek in vain in other pre-Christian literatures, and a delicacy of sentiment scarcely possible for a Christian priest."

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

Roman Road. By G. R. Lamb. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

Roman Road, published by Sheed and Ward, may suggest to a title scanner a path direct, and defiant of obstacle, resolutely built by one of life's imperialists. Be thankful to find instead an account of a ramble that begins in Manchester and ends for the time being with Mr Lamb's baptism at the hands of a Roman Catholic priest.

He tells with charming diffidence of happy early days at an elementary school: how after winning a scholarship he went to a grammar school and experienced on tender adolescent "feelers" the change from warm working-class sentiments to the anxious excelsior emotions of the lower middle classes. At Cambridge he was self and system questioning, but almost settled down with the Aldelpli Community at Langham, where he went as a C.O. in the recent European war. Finally, not feeling quite at home there, he became lone gardener to curious households until he deliberately sought employment with a Roman Catholic school, where he was baptized and "we all four . . . went into the headmaster's study for a glass of beer." The End. And quite right too for so ardent an admirer of G.K.C.!

But I think Mr Lamb will run on past this deceptively confident winning post. It is not in tune with his inconclusive temperament and his deep homelessness. One imagines that he will need somethink like Langham under the aegis of his new allegiance, for he feels very deeply the disintegration of our culture and the lack of social solidarity that is so scarifying to the artistic temperament. We belong neither to God, to one another, nor to a demesne.

Here is a personal witness to the sociologist's condemnation of our society as atomized, without humus and eroding. And it is effective because towards himself our author is detached, he regards George Lamb with cool appraisal and, in charity, recalls and describes his own inward feelings without self-pity, concealment, or self-puff. One cannot doubt his sincerity as he heeds so profitably the counsels of St Francis de Sales in the Introduction to the Devout Life, part 3, chapter 9, and one may well believe that, in an age when education is the main social ladder, he speaks for many who do not understand their own unrest nor could so well express it if they did.

M. P. Ralph Bowman.

Ashbrittle.

Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms, 1521. By Gordon Rupp. S.C.M. Press. 9s.

The early life of Luther is the most attractive and yet most difficult of the problems about him. Here is the Luther who can proclaim the great insights of the Reformation without having yet to face the hammering of them into a workable system. When Luther stands against the world he can still capture the imagination as he captured the German people in the two years before the Diet of Worms. Yet it is not easy to write of his life before the nailing of the ninety-five theses. For the evidence largely depends upon the *Table*

Talk, a collection of Luther's conversations written sometimes inaccurately by a number of Boswells; and the recollections of an old gentleman at dinner are not always a reliable authority for the events, reasons, or thought, of his youthful career. His earliest biographers did not know him until after he was celebrated. And both the *Table Talk* and the biographers read into the past the outlook of the flourishing Lutheran movement. In the twentieth century our knowledge of his early life has been deepened by the publication of some of his early lectures and other writings, in particular the publication in 1904 by Ficker of the *Commentary on Romans* of 1515 to 1516. The discoveries of this century have shown that the foundations of Luther's theology had been laid long before the ninety-five theses—in fact, that it was his theology which drove him into practical opposition, not his practical opposition which drove him to formulate a theology. But it cannot be said that the problems are solved.

Mr Rupp's short book has succeeded in the formidable task of introducing these problems to the public while never allowing the quick movement of the narrative to be slowed to the ponderous pace of an academic discussion. He understands not only Lutheran scholarship, he understands Luther: and he brings to Luther a sympathy and an affection which is always sane, always fair, and which never degenerates into hagiography or worship. Those who look to Mr Rupp for the telling epigram will not be disappointed—"Luther has never received sufficient credit for the books he never wrote", and *passim*. They will also find a charming mastery of the concrete detail—Eck grumbling at the quality of the Leipzig beer, Luther travelling on the cart from Heidelberg and overwhelming his bored companion with a flood of theology, Luther sending to the dying Tetzel a generous letter of consolation.

Owen Chadwick.

Trinity Hall,
Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary. By Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr. New York: Oxford University Press. $10.00.

Mr Shepherd's *Commentary* is designed to replace the American edition of the late Bishop Barry's *The Teacher's Prayer Book*, now long out of print. The work is admirably conceived and executed. The text of the American Prayer Book, according to the standard pagination, is printed on the left-hand page, and the comment on the right. Some pages of the Prayer Book, however, demand and receive more extended treatment. Mr Shepherd summarizes liturgical history and information, Latin, Greek, and Anglican, lucidly and without pedantry or dullness; and combines it, where appropriate, with "spiritual interpretation of the various prayers", intended (as the Dean of Washington Cathedral observes in a Foreword) to help

the reader "to see the inward and spiritual meaning of the outward words and acts". English Anglicans will find the *Commentary* of the greatest interest, as well for its revelation of what is specially significant from the American point of view, as for its account of American Prayer Book history. The wise churchgoer, on whichever side of the Atlantic, who keeps this book in his pew, can now, with as much pleasure as profit, defy pulpit tedium for the rest of his life.

E. C. Ratcliff.

Jesus and the Resurrection. By H. A. Williams. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

This book has an importance altogether beyond its size; indeed, it is not too much to say that it ought to become a little religious classic. Written originally as the Bishop of London's Lent Book, it is significant for every season of the Christian year. The style and the spirit are admirable, and the ideas, simply and beautifully expressed, are profound and moving. Mr Williams seeks to show the resurrection as "the context of Christian living", considering it in five chapters as the life of Christians, as their death, as the conquest of time, the guarantee of personality, and as the revelation of truth. His debt, gladly acknowledged, to Bishop Westcott, F. D. Maurice, Professor O. C. Quick, and others, is manifest, but he shows a remarkable power of transmuting all he takes over and of re-minting it in his coinage. So, for example, in the first chapter he argues that Christianity is either the Easter faith or it is not a faith at all, and that the resurrection is a mighty creative act of God, into the wave of which the Christian is caught up, through Baptism and the Eucharist, into an experience which is the power of a new moral life and a sharing in the creation of a new world order. There is no space to summarize his treatment of the remaining themes. We can only say that the chapters are equally thoughtful, suggestive, and inspirational.

Vincent Taylor.

Wesley College,
Leeds.

The New Testament: A Conspectus. By J. W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro. The Colet Library, No. 10. Duckworth. 6s.

The late Bishop of Truro's little book is in some respects so pleasing that the reader forgets to ask for whom it can have been intended. Not, surely, for even the first-year undergraduate reading theology; he needs stronger meat. But again, surely not for the man who has for the first time sat down to read "a gospel, e.g. Luke, and an epistle, e.g. Philippians" (p. 7); if this man begins to understand the New Testament at all he will not wish to be sidetracked immediately into textual criticism and similar studies. For whom, then? It is difficult to say, and easy to regret the requirements of a series which asked for too much in too little space. It would, however, be quite unfair not to add that, when its limitations are remembered, the

book contains excellent matter, which the author has contrived to make both compact and interesting—a task in which not all the writers of New Testament Introductions succeed. A few points, notably in the chapter on textual criticism, call for correction or reconsideration; but the book as a whole is (as far as it goes) a sane and sober guide, and draws attention to some of the most significant passages in the books of the New Testament, though it does less to point out the great themes which hold the books together.

C. K. Barrett.

Durham University.

Christian Faith and Practice. By Leonard Hodgson. Blackwell. 8s. 6d.

Dr Hodgson has published in this volume the course of open lectures which he delivered for several years as Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford. He emphasizes that their purpose was to be descriptive of what Christianity is, and not argumentative or apologetic. They are marked by the well-known characteristics of Dr Hodgson's writing, and constitute a concise account of his theological teaching. The book will probably be most serviceable to theological students and to believers who are trying to think out their faith in a coherent way.

At the Lord's Table. Directions for the use of the celebrant at the Holy Eucharist. By V. G. Shearburn, C.R. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

The directions here given are clear, concise, and detailed. They are based on an adaptation of the Roman ceremonial for Low Mass; while there may be forms of ceremonial that make equally for reverence and common sense, it is not easy to discover them. The manner of celebrating the Holy Communion in the Church of England would be generally much more edifying if directions such as these given in this booklet were carefully followed by all priests. It will prove useful to ordinands preparing for the priesthood, to any priests who never had the good fortune to be carefully trained in this matter, and indeed to all celebrants as a means of periodically checking their behaviour at the altar. There can be no doubt that precise attention to detail, if given in the spirit recommmended by Fr Shearburn, is the best safeguard against slovenliness, fussiness, and idiosyncrasies.

Good-bye to my Generation. By Bishop Walter Carey. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

This is described as "an informal autobiography". It is Bishop Carey talking at his best. His life has been full of varied and exciting experiences, and he seems to have enjoyed almost every minute of it. He is a great mixer, and he has excellent stories to tell of people he

has met. Even those who find his radiance a little too much of a good thing will not easily put the book down once they have begun to read it—except to stoke the fire, so that they can sit up and finish it. It is a document bursting with unaffected faith and hope in God, and also in the Church of England.

Actes de la Conférence de l'Église Orthodoxe Russe, 8-18 July 1948. Moscow, 1950.

A record in French of the persons present and of the actual words spoken at the Conference of the Russian Orthodox Church that was held in Moscow in 1948.

No Faith of my Own. By J. V. Langmead Casserley. Longmans. 9s. 6d.

This is the *confessio fidei* of one who was brought up in a severely "rationalist" environment, and to whom the Christian faith came as an exciting and liberating revelation. It invites and stands comparison with Miss Rosalind Murray's *The Good Pagan's Failure*. The main part of the book is a simple but arresting exposition of the elements of the faith. It is written with gusto. There is nothing laboured about it. There is an important chapter at the end on the various causes of modern unbelief.

Vetus Testamentum. Vol. I, No. I. By E. J. Brill, Oude Rijn 33A-35, Leiden, Holland. £2 per annum.

This new learned quarterly is published by the International Organization of Old Testament Scholars. Most of the contributions in the first number, which consists of 80 pp. with illustrations, are in English, but German and French are also used. A. Alt writes on "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda", L. H. Brockington on "The Greek translator of Isaiah and his interest in *ΔΟΞΑ*", and there are two articles on the Hebrew Scrolls. The journal is beautifully printed, and will be a valuable addition to the resources of students of the Old Testament.

Irénikon (4e Trimestre, 1950) contains a useful article on "Le Baptême et la Foi" by Father Jerôme Hamer, O.P., in which he considers the theology of infant baptism with reference to the views of Professors Karl Barth and Oscar Cullmann.

Christianity on the Frontier. By John A. Mackay. Lutterworth Press. 8s. 6d.

A collection of Dr Mackay's occasional writings during the past six years, mostly his editorials in *Theology To-day*. The book makes a worthy sequel to *A Preface to Christian Theology*. By the "frontier" he means the "place where life's most crucial issues await a Christian decision" and also the new areas which are waiting to be possessed in the name of Christ.

A. R. V.

THE FUTURE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE. A Study in Responsibility. By George Goyder. Blackwell. 9s. 6d.

Mr Goyder performs a valuable function in analysing the form of the modern company, which is legally only responsible to the shareholders, whereas in fact there are four parties in industry, the shareholder, the worker, the consumer, and the community. The corporate aims of industry according to this natural order (particularly in order "to bring the claims of justice to bear on the problems of relations between employer and employee") should be openly and legally expressed in the company's memorandum and articles, on the lines of the Carl Zeiss Foundation at Jena. To meet the fourfold responsibility company structure must be modified, by making workers members with voting rights and a special director, as the consumers and the community are also to have. Profits are to be shared in prescribed amounts between the various objects, and all ordinary shares are to be redeemed at least after fifty years.

Those already acquainted with the problems of modern industry will find this book stimulating. It is likely to have a special appeal to Christians with its background of frontier thinking; and a wider appeal in apparently providing an alternative to both unchecked capitalism and the planned society. But it is likely to be dangerous to those who are innocent of any knowledge of the economics of industry, as this book will hardly enlighten them.

The traditional defence of the profit criterion, as the means of ensuring that industry serves the consumer and enterprise is stimulated, is ignored. Mr Goyder admits "that industry exists for the consumer and not *vice versa*", but in practice the consumer is given very little attention. He belongs to the modern school of British business men who have forgotten what competition really means or have turned their backs on it. One of his main purposes is to "retain the advantages of self-government, now threatened by State action through (among other things) anti-monopoly legislation". He is unaware of the dangers we may suffer from "responsible" business men (such as the ossification of industry in a semi-corporative economy). This is because he fails to hold clearly in front of his mind that business exists not to carry on a way of life, but to serve the consumer, and because he ignores the need for a proper pricing policy and for incentives for business men to be efficient and flexible.

If this book had been put forward as "A Method of Socialization (in the widest sense) suitable for Certain Firms", it would be welcomed by many who regret the recent Labour one-track concentration on the public corporation as the sole method of "nationalization". But industry is too varied to put all public companies in this strait-jacket. To call a book *The Future of Private Enterprise* which has practically nothing to say about enterprise, and hardly mentions such pressing problems as productivity, capital raising and investment policy, price policy, and restrictive practices, is to mislead the reader, and particularly those who may be unaware of the importance of these problems.

D. L. MUNBY.

KING'S COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

HE CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN and THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS. By Charles Williams. Faber. 16s.

Messrs Faber and Faber are to be thanked for bringing back into circulation those of Charles Williams's theological works which have been out of print. *He Came Down from Heaven* was first published in 1938. *The Forgiveness of Sins* was reviewed in THEOLOGY, April, 1943, by Prof. A. M. Ramsey, and what he said of that applies to all Charles Williams's work, viz.: "The theology is presented with a rare freshness of illustration and a freedom from the ways of professional theological writing."

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

A.P.C.K. (DUBLIN): W. Gamble, *William Bedell: his Life and Times* (10s. 6d.).
A. AND C. BLACK: Leo Shirley Price, *Confucius and Christ* (21s.).
BLOUD ET GAY: Maurice Nédoncelle, *Trois Aspects du Problème Anglo-Catholique au XVII^e siècle* (390 fr.).
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: C. H. Dodd, *The Coming of Christ* (four addresses broadcast during Advent, 1950) (3s. 6d.).
CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: H. Cook, *The Theology of Evangelism* (6s.).
CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (PHILADELPHIA): C. R. Barnes, *The General Convention Offices and Officers, 1785–1950* ($3.00).
CHURCHMAN PUBLISHING CO.: F. Barrie Flint, *Letters to a Country Parson* (3s.); J. E. Roscoe, *Evolution and the Virgin Birth* (1s. 6d.).
DOBSON: S. L. Bethell, *The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (15s.).
DUCKWORTH: T. H. Robinson, *A Short Comparative History of Religions* (7s. 6d.).
FABER: Daniel Jenkins, *Tradition and the Spirit* (12s. 6d.).
HUTCHINSON: F. H. Smith, *The Buddist Way of Life* (7s. 6d.); A. S. Tritton, *Islam* (7s. 6d.).
INDEPENDENT PRESS: P. W. Ackroyd, *Freedom in Action* (3s. 6d.).
INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: A. Stewart, *Roman Dogma and Scripture Truth* (2s. 6d.).
JOHN LLOYD: John Levy, *Immediate Knowledge and Happiness* (12s. 6d.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: J. R. Coates, *The Saving History* (3s. 6d.).
MOWBRAY: *The Story of the Christian Church* (Broadcast Talks) (3s. 6d.).
MUNKSGAARD (COPENHAGEN): Aage Henriksen, *Kierkegaard Studies in Scandinavia* (21s.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: L. E. Browne, *Where Science and Religion Meet* (6s.).
ROCKLIFF: Henri Talon, *John Bunyan* (25s.).
SHEED AND WARD: A. Jones, *Unless Some Man Show Me* (8s. 6d.); J. Coventry, *Faith Seeks Understanding* (7s. 6d.).
SKEFFINGTON: W. H. Elliott, *Growing Old* (7s. 6d.); R. A. R. Spread, *Stretching forth Thine Hand to Heal* [New edition] (4s. 6d.); E. S. Loveday, *A Great View* (Sermons and addresses) (7s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: J. Lawson, *What do we Believe?* (6s. 6d.).
TYNDALE PRESS: A. Rendle Short, *Archaeology gives Evidence* (2s.); James Denney, *The Death of Christ* (Edited by R. V. G. Tasker) (9s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher